

[University of Kentucky](#)**MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, September 27, 1999**

The University Senate met in special session at 3:00 p.m., September 27, 1999 in the Auditorium of the W. T. Young Library.

Professor Roy Moore, Chair of the Senate Council presided.

Members absent were: Behruz Abadi, Walter Abbott, weal Ahmed, Ali Amoli, Sammy Anderson, Joseph Anthony*, Leon Assael, Ruth Bettie, Suketu Bhavsar, Jeffrey Bieber, Anibal Biglieri, Lars Bjork, Deborah Blades, George Blindfold, Rachel Bomberger, Anna Bosch, Douglas Body, Fitzgerald Bramwell, James Brennan, Eugene Bruce*, Geza Bruckner, Joseph Burch, Laretta Byars, Sandra Carey*, Charles Carlson*, Ben Carr, Edward Carter, Keisha Carter, William Cohen, Robert Dahlstrom, Mary Davis, George DeBin, Susan DeCarvalho, Jeffrey Dembo, David Durant, Roberta Dwyer, Nolen Embry*, Vincent Fields, Juanita Fleming, Richard Furst, Eugene Gaetke, John Garen, Amber Gatlin, James Gibbs, Jonathan Golding, Larry Grabau, Philip Greasley, Howard Grotch, O. J. Hahn, Steven Haist, Issam Harik, Debra Harley, Bernard Hennig, Patrick Herring, Kay Hoffman, James Holsinger, Patricia Howard, Craig Infanger, Mike Inman, Chad Jeske, David Johnson, Alan Kaplan, Benjamin Karp, Edward Kasarskis, James Kerley, Richard Kermode, Keith Kinderknecht, Thomas Lester, Jane Lindle, C. Oran Little, William Lubawy, William Maloney, Loys Mather, Patrick McGrath, Mark Meier, David Mohny, Mary Molinaro, Robert Molzon, Margo Monteith, Kathryn Moore, James Morris, Phyllis Nash*, Michael Nettle, William O'Connor, Miles Osland, James Parker, Ron Pen, Thomas Pope, Shirley Raines, Dan Reedy, Luke Riddle, Ellen Riggle, Thomas Robinson, Elizabeth Rompf, Kathryn Sallee, Margaret Saunier, Jan Schach, Claire Schmelzer, Robert Shay, Kelley Shields, Steven Skinner David Sloan, Sharon Stewart, David Stockham, Kaveh Tagavi, John Thelin, Enid Waldhart, Retia Walker, Charles Wethington*, Carolyn Williams, Eugene Williams, Emery Wilson, Vicki Wilson*, Deborah Witham, Thomas Zentall, Elisabeth Zinser.

Chairperson Moore called the meeting to order. This idea for an orientation session came out of suggestions made to me about a year and a half ago while I was Chair Elect of the Senate Council. We had such a good response last year that we thought we would continue it again this year. The idea is for those of you who are new to get some kind of primer of what we do both in the Senate and the Senate Council.

I would like to introduce the members of the Senate Council: Lee Meyer, Vice-Chair of the Senate Council, Loys Mather who is at a meeting in Frankfort of the Council on Post-Secondary Education, Don Frazier, Jane Wells, Charles Coulston, Ray Cox, Bill Fortune, Luke Riddle, Jimmy Glenn who is the SGA President, Keisha Carter, Dan Reedy who is also in Frankfort, Brad Canon, and David Durant.

We also have Don Witt the University Registrar and Secretary to the University Senate, Susan Caldwell who takes the minutes, and Cindy Todd who is the Staff Assistant in the Senate Council Office. Cindy has been here for about twenty-seven years. She is a very valuable resource for anyone who wants to know about rules and procedures.

There will be a reception following the meeting and I encourage you to attend.

* Absence Explained

The Senate meets on the second Monday of every month. If you do not get a notice, something must have happened with the mail. Do not assume if you do not get a notice that there is not a senate meeting. If you are

not sure, call and we will tell you.

The Senate Council, which is a smaller group of fourteen people, ordinarily fifteen people, meets every Monday (or just about every Monday) during the regular year at the same time as the Senate, which is 3:00 p.m. However, we meet in the Old Board Room of the Administration Building. Anyone is welcome to come. It is an open meeting. Sometimes new senators like to come just to see what goes on in the Senate Council. We will be glad to supply a copy of the agenda. It is posted on the bulletin board in the Senate Council Office. The Senate Council Office is downstairs in Room 10 of the Administration Building.

All the rules, including updates are posted on the Senate Web site. Last year we distributed hard copies, which was fairly expensive, so this year, since there are relatively few changes, we felt justified in not reprinting. There are some hard copies left of the old edition. You can also print a copy of the new one from the Web. The easiest way is just to cut and paste those specific rules you are interested in. Also on the Web site you will find the minutes going back several years. There is also information about the various committees. This year, for the first time, we have added the committees that are appointed by the President.

The Senate, of course, is a University Senate, which includes students, faculty, and administrators who are ex-officio voting members. Half of them vote in the even years and half in the odd years. This is all specified in the rules. The elected Senate has 114 members of whom 94 are faculty and 19 are students, and one emeriti faculty member is elected by the emeriti faculty association. There are also 12 or 13 ex-officio voting members. There are ex-officio nonvoting members, such as the President and vice-presidents.

The primary functions of the Senate are, first, to determine broad academic policies of the University. It does say that the Senate determines--not recommends or suggests--broad academic policies. The Senate is also responsible for approving any new academic programs, curricula, and courses. The Senate is responsible for the University calendar. Sometimes the calendar gets a little controversial, such as when we created a fall break. The Senate also advises the President on the planning of physical facilities and staff as it relates to educational objectives. It is a recommending body when it comes to the establishment, alteration, or abolition of educational units such as departments or colleges. The Senate advises the President on committees. Area Committees, for example, are appointed by the President on recommendations from the Senate Council. The Senate determines admission policies.

The Senate Council, which is the smaller group, basically functions to some extent as a screening body. We get most things first before you do, some of which we then pass on to you. There are others over which we have the final say. The Senate Council is a pretty busy group of individuals. We do not meet every week during the summer, but we do meet usually once or twice a month during the summer, so work does continue during that time. If you have a question regarding where a particular item is, the best person to contact is Cindy Todd. She keeps the records and has extremely well organized files.

If you want to get an item on the Senate agenda, there are three different ways in which you can do that. First is through the Senate Council. Senate Rule I-1.2.3 says the Senate Council can determine the agenda for the Senate. It may be something that will have to go through a committee; it depends on what the particular proposal is about. The second way is upon the written recommendation of anyone to the Senate Council and then it would go on to the Senate. Anyone who wants can petition the Senate Council to get an item on the agenda. The last way is through a committee recommendation. Each committee has its own responsibilities. Often going through a committee is the best way to do it. You have the expertise of the committee members, and they can raise questions at that point and alert you to any problems that you may have later on. My recommendation is if you do have a particular item, see if you can send it through a committee first or refer it to me and I will be glad to refer it to the Council or a committee rather than try to bring it before the Senate

Council directly.

There are three ways in which a meeting of the Senate can be called. First, the President of the University, who is the chair of the Senate, can call a special meeting of the Senate. The Senate Council can call a special meeting and did so this summer by a majority vote. The third way is that ten elected members of the Senate can file a written request for a special meeting of the Senate.

All meetings of the Senate and the Senate Council are open to the public and to the press. Sometimes you will see the press here. Usually they are not here unless there is something particularly controversial.

There is a ten-day notice rule. If an item is to be considered by the Senate for action, it must be circulated ten days in advance. That does not apply to discussion items. Often the Senate will put an item on the agenda for discussion only. We will try to abide by the ten-day circulation rule for all items but the ten-day circulation rule applies specifically to action items. Any action item has to be circulated ten days in advance unless the Senate decides at that meeting to waive the ten-day rule.

Senate Council meetings are posted on the bulletin board, and notice is given to members of the Senate Council. Those notices are not sent out to everyone. There is a list and if you want to be on the list, you can notify me.

In order for there to be a quorum, the chair must know that there are 45 voting members present. If 45 voting members are present, that is sufficient for a quorum. One thing that often comes up is that people leave, and it does not appear that there is a quorum. The way the rule works is as long as no one calls for a quorum, the Senate can still continue to operate until someone calls for a quorum. If someone calls to determine whether or not there is a quorum, then we must determine whether there are 45 people present. I am not suggesting that you should not call for a quorum if you realize there are not enough people here, I am just telling you that action can still be taken if there is not a quorum present so long as someone has not called for a quorum vote.

Roll call can be called by a vote of twenty-five percent of the members present. If someone wants a roll call to know how people vote, you do not need a majority vote. All that is needed is twenty-five percent of the members present. The Chair also has the authority to call for a roll call vote. You can not debate or amend a roll call vote. Once someone calls for a roll call vote, there has to be a vote on whether or not there will be a roll call vote. Someone can not say they are against a roll call vote.

The responsibilities of the Senate Council are pretty broad. You can look under Senate Rule I.3.1.1 in the Senate Rules. Concerning Senate Council membership, there are nine members elected by the Senate. Two members are elected by the students from the student membership. The SGA President and the two faculty members from the Board of Trustees are also members. We currently have fourteen members and the reason for that is the immediate past chair ordinarily serves as an ex-officio nonvoting member and since I am the immediate past chair, I asked for a ruling on that and the Rules Committee determined that I am the immediate past chair and don't get two votes.

A quorum of the Council is six, and thus we can not take action unless there are six members present. The terms of the Council are for three years, just as it is for the Senate. If you are elected to the Council and you are no longer a senator then your term will continue for the rest of your Senate Council term.

The Chair and Vice-Chair are elected in December. We elect a person in December as the chair-elect.

As I introduce the committees, I have asked each committee chair or representative of that committee to briefly talk about what the committee does and give you some examples of what the committee did last year

or may be doing this coming year. I always begin with the Rules and Elections Committee, and Brad Canon is the chair of that. It is an extremely important committee as you might imagine. It interprets the rules and conducts the elections. Brad has been a chair of the Rules Committee at least twice, I have been chair twice, and Doug Michael, the chair last year was chair twice. So if you ever get elected chair of that committee, watch out. You are likely to continue for another year.

Professor Canon made the following remarks:

We do three or four things on the Rules Committee. Probably our most frequent activity is to interpret the rules. We get questions from various people, deans, chairs, and students, usually involving some type of dispute. We sort of act like a court and make a ruling and file it with Cindy and the Registrar's office. We codify the rules. The Senate passes new rules or amended rules during the year we codify or put into legal form. We conduct elections. We literally count the ballots with help from Susan. Occasionally, there are questions about eligibility of either candidates or voters in the election. Sometimes we make proposals to change the rules on our own, especially rules that relate to elections or relate to how the Senate or some other council proceeds. We make recommendations on procedural rules.

Last year we were asked to interpret the dead week rule, the rule that prohibits tests or what not will be given the last week of the semester. The question was from the Student Government; did this rule prohibit all new assignments during the last week of the semester? We felt that no it did not, that some courses assignments were pretty regular and involved homework. In many courses a ruling against any homework during the last of the semester would effectively prohibit the introduction of new materials. Another interesting question was a case that came up involving a student not in a class that had taken the class previously, loaning his old paper to a student in the class. He was caught. The student who turned in the plagiarized paper was punished, but the question was could the person who loaned the paper be punished. We held that there was no rule covering that. It was not plagiarism or cheating on the part of the loaning student because the rules required someone be in the class. We may get a half dozen questions like this a year.

If you have a question about a rule interpretation either send it to Roy and he will forward it to me or you can send it to me directly, Bran Canon. My e-mail should be in the new directory when it comes out.

Chairperson Moore said that Chairs of committees who are not senators are nonvoting members of the Senate. You can also be a member of a Senate committee even though you are not a member of the Senate.

The Chair next introduced the chair of the Academic Facilities Committee, Bruce Walcott.

Professor Walcott made the following remarks:

We are the Academic Facilities Committee and are charged with the alteration, the use and maintenance of any physical property or space on the University in terms of supporting educational objectives, not research objectives.

In terms of what we did last year, there is actually a report filed with the Senate Council from last year's chair, Mary Molinaro. She did a great job of chairing the committee. We spent the first part of the year collecting lots and lots of data and then met in the later part of the year, making recommendations based on that data. Some of the recommendations you will be seeing coming out of the Senate Council in one form or another. There was \$750,000 of nonrecurring funding allotted by the Administration last year for the purposes of renovating and upgrading classroom space. We were very pleased to see that, yet we felt some sort of recurring cost would be better, rather than doing a huge improvement and then letting the space become

dilapidated. Particularly mentioned in the report was Funkhouser. Also Chemistry's space is getting dilapidated as well. Those were the two facilities that were mentioned particularly. We also said that it would be nice for Physical Plant to keep an eye on what is going on and let us know their suggestions. In terms of agenda items that I have for my committee, we need to make sure that the commendations that Mary's leadership came up with last year are followed through. I would like to see what is going on in terms of the library for the Math Science Program. Many of you have to walk around when you go to Chemistry-Physics because of the big construction area. They are renovating the facade there, yet I am told through various means that we are not ready to move into that space yet. Fine Arts had had some money put into that, yet for the sciences and math and engineering, the space is not ready for us to occupy. I want to move that along from a personal standpoint. Another agenda item is all the smart classrooms and technology that we are putting into our classes. I feel it is kind of an oxymoron when the facilities there are not being upgraded. For example, I know in Engineering we have seats from 1964 that are thirty-five years old. Kids spend their time in class with one hand writing notes and the other hand holding the back of the chair to keep it from falling off. If you know of a problem with your space, again it has to be educationally oriented, it could encompass computer or class facilities, we are the place to come with that information. At the end of the year we will make recommendations to the Senate or even an agenda item if we feel like it needs to be discussed amongst this body. Most of our committee members are going to be through at the end of this year, so if you are looking for a place to make a name for yourself, we are recruiting.

The Chair recognized Tom Troland, the Chair of the Academic Programs Committee.

Professor Troland made the following remarks:

Thank you very much, Roy. The Academic Programs Committee is charged with reviewing academic programs that are newly proposed to the University. Specifically, in the Senate Rules it says we are charged with reviewing the academic excellence, the need, the impact, and the desirability and priority of any new academic program in relationship to other programs. It is an interesting committee to be on because most of the programs we are asked to review are programs very far from my expertise and often very far from the expertise of the individual committee members although often we have at least one member who is professionally competent in that particular area. For example, last year we were asked to review a Ph.D. program in Rehabilitation Science, and this is something I personally know very little about. But, nonetheless, the committee is charged with looking at more strategic overall goals. For example, the committee is asked to look to see if the new programs have some indication of academic rigor, not too light weight for a university type thing. We are asked to look to see if there is support from the University. This will be necessary if this program is instituted. For example, if new faculty members are going to be needed and new courses are going to be taught, where will the faculty members come from? We are asked to look at things such as whether or not other units on campus will be connected some way with the proposal. For example, a new proposal for a program might require new courses be taught by another department on campus. It is up to us to make sure that the other department has been consulted and that they have the resources necessary to do that. Also, we are asked to see if the new program is one which is also being offered elsewhere around the country. If we are offering a program that is not being offered elsewhere around the country, there should be some grounds for explaining why a new ground breaking program would be appropriate here at the University of Kentucky. Finally, we are asked to determine to the extent that we can whether or not there is a real demand for the program. This year we have two programs that have been brought before us already. There is a Doctorate of Nursing and also a Ph.D. in Family Studies before us right now. This committee meets on something of an ad hoc basis; we do not meet on a regular monthly basis, but consult and meet as necessary as various programs come before us. Some years there may be no such programs and some years there may be several.

The Chair next recognized recognized Ling Hwey Jeng, chair of the Library Committee, and Paul Willis, Director of Libraries.

Professor Jeng made the following remarks:

The Library is basically the soul of the campus and I think that everybody has a stake in it. A lot of people do not realize where to go when they have some concerns about the library. This committee is the one that serves as a liaison between the library and the campus, including faculty, staff, and students. Last year we dealt with some issues that came up with the library student rooms, where some study rooms were reserved for faculty to use and others reserved for graduate students. There was some under use on the faculty side and over crowding for the students. The library has asked us to help them review the policies and make it more flexible so that the rooms could be used more effectively.

This year I have met with the Director of Libraries, Mr. Paul Willis, and we have identified a few issues that we may have to address. One, of course, is the reserve. Many of you probably have received a notice about putting the reserve up on the web, and therefore the reserve policy will have to be looked at carefully and we may have to determine things like copyright issues. The second thing that some of you probably know is that we are going to have a new online catalog. The NOTIS system will be replaced by Endeavor, which is a very good system but it is also the Library's desire to have the committee to help them to help faculty, staff, and students to go through this transition from one system to another. The last thing, which is also a very important issue, is how this Young Library, this new facility, has served the community. The library has a very strong desire to solicit feedback from all the constituents and has asked the committee to serve as a facilitator and coordinator in this area. Maybe we will want to do a focus group or something along this line. That will be something that we will be working on. Again, it is very important for me to stress that if anyone has any concern about the library, any problems or concerns, this committee is the place to come and we will deal with it. We have been working very well with the library.

Chairperson Moore recognized Ray Cox, chair of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee.

Professor Cox made the following remarks:

We are the largest committee. There are 15 people on our committee. Basically, we have responsibilities for Sections IV and V of the Senate Rules, which are the sections dealing with admissions criteria for the University and what is called Attending the University, which has to do with grades and grade procedures, probation suspension status, and things like that. We cover a pretty broad spectrum of responsibilities. In terms of what is coming up now, we have a proposal from Chemical Engineering to change admission requirements in their a selective admission program. We have a proposal from Dietetics for their entrance and progression requirements. We have the honor code from the College of Law. In terms of extra things that I think I am going to have our committee take a shot at is the concerns about distance learning, the academic quality control for off campus, TV programs and internet programs.

The Chair recognized John Picoro, chair of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee.

Professor Picoro made the following remarks:

This will be my first year as chair of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee. It is concerned with major broad long-range plans and priorities of the University. Some of our charges are to identify major academic problems likely to be faced by the University in the foreseeable future, to formulate and recommend to the Senate plausible academic goals for the institution, to develop procedures and criteria for

recommending priorities, to recommend to the Senate institutional policies that recognize academic priorities and goals, assess the progress of the Institution toward its goals and report periodically to the Senate, recommend to the Senate a means for increasing the University's effectiveness in establishing and implementing its academic policy, and serve the Senate and Administration as a source of faculty information and opinion concerning academic planning and priorities.

Some issues that I think should be on the table is how does Lexington Community College fit into UK from an academic standpoint. I do not think that has been clarified yet, and it is something our committee will probably take up. Secondly, retention and graduation rates. We might take a look college by college at what the graduation rates are and see what the good ones are doing and see if we can come up with a proposal. Also take a look at distance learning, specifically how to preserve academic integrity in that situation.

Chairperson Moore recognized Cliff Hynniman, chair of the Academic Organization and Structure Committee, who is continuing as chair for a second year.

Professor Hynniman made the following remarks:

This committee meets on an ad hoc basis and it reviews proposals and recommendations on priorities for new academic units, abolishment or merger of academic units, and major changes to the organizational structure. It also has the responsibility to recommend the creation or abolishment of changes in the organizational structure and to study and report on matters regarding size, strength, and student enrollment. Those last two items we have not really done anything with in the last couple of years and to my knowledge maybe in a couple of years prior to that those have not been issues before the committee. We have guidelines that we follow doing this kind of review. Those guidelines are available to anyone that wants to create a new academic unit within the University. It helps our work considerably in reviewing the issue. We look at programmatic concerns. Does the unit proposal meet the creditation standards? Is it consistent with strategic plans? What about its individual impact on faculty resources for teaching, service, and research. We look at those issues. What about the impact on students and the commitments that have been previously made to students? Probably most importantly, has there been an opportunity for discussion? What we have seen in the last year or so as we have looked at some of these proposals, faculty that you would think would be aware of those proposals were not aware. It seems to me that a very important component is to insure that there has been adequate discussion among the units or sectors of the University that are involved, how they are affected. Are there letters of support or documents supporting the changes that are being recommended? Most of the proposals, I guess, have come to us from the Chair of the Senate Council and come to him by the Administration of the University. Some examples that we have looked at over the last two years, are the Center for Health Services Management Research. Another was the School of Public Health. Another was a name change for the Department of Geological Sciences to the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, the creation of a Department of Landscape Architecture, the Center for Minimally Invasive Surgery, the Spinal Cord and Brain Injury Research Center. As a result of looking at some of these centers we made a recommendation to the Senate Council that a recommendation go forward to the President that the Administrative Regulations be changed because currently they do not read as though the Senate has a responsibility to review Centers or Institutes even though they are academic units. So we made the recommendation that the Administrative Regulations be changed for that reason. This year we do not have anything coming before the committee that I am aware of, so we may have a meeting and look at some of the previous accreditation reports of organizational recommendations that have been made to see if anyone wants to bring forward any recommendations.

Chairperson Moore recognized David Hamilton, chair of the Research Committee:

Professor Hamilton made the following remarks:

The Research Committee has an unusual history. It was originally mandated by NSF and changed, and there was some sort of search for a mandate for this particular body. For the last couple of years, we have been trying to provide a faculty vehicle for staying in touch with the Reedy Task Force on Research and Graduate Studies and the subsequent efforts to implement those recommendations with the various trust funds and matching funds and other programs. We try to meet with Vice-Chancellor Bramwell, Dave Watt, and Jim Boling to discuss the achievements, the limitations, and the problems with these various programs, their consequences for the University, what they might mean to the future structure of it. From my own personal standpoint, I have some concerns about this process. I think that much of it is very impressive, but I am concerned about the effects of targeting, I have a strong desire to sustain a broad base of research opportunities for all faculty at this institution. Above all, I would like to provide an avenue or outlet for continued faculty discussion, faculty involvement in the research progress at this institution. I hope to continue with this focus in the coming year, trying to meet with Jim Boling and his counterparts in the Medical Center fairly early in the semester. If anyone has any concerns about any of these programs or any aspect of research at the institution, please e-mail me or any other member of the committee with any proposals or ideas.

The Chair recognized Doug Poe, chair of the Institutional Finance and Resource Committee:

Professor Poe made the following remarks:

This committee has the general charge of keeping the Senate and Senate Council informed about University budgetary matters and resource allocation. We do not deal with any specifics unless something were to come through the Senate and some department felt they were being discriminated against, but, in general that is left to the purview of administrators to take care of. We met for the last couple of years with both Chancellors or their representatives. We have tried for a number of years to gain a more proactive role for faculty in the budgetary process. When I was first put on the committee, eight or ten years ago, we had a couple years where we did not meet at all because, basically, process was such at that time that the budget was generally determined in the back rooms in Frankfort, and any input that you have right up until the time the budget was cut would be thrown out the window if conditions changed. There was just not much opportunity for us to get involved, and there was even discussion in the Senate as to whether this committee would continue. But in the last few years the budgetary process has become a little more professional and a little less political than it was at that time. We were involved or at least kept up to date by the Administration on the RCT Funds. They came and made presentations to the Senate Council with regard to this. This year we again are continuing to press for a little bit more proactive role for faculty. We surveyed our benchmark schools a couple years ago plus a few additional schools to look at how much of a role faculty had in the budgetary process at those universities and found, as you might guess a mixture. We presented that information and there is some receptiveness on the part of the Chancellor to allow a little bit more faculty participation. We are going to try to meet with the Central Administration and with both Chancellors this fall to look at next year's decision package for the budget. What usually happens most years I have been on the committee is that a midyear there is a midyear correction in the budget and typically we meet with the Chancellor, especially on Lexington Campus, to review what has been done. If there is anything that alarms us, then we can go to the Senate Council, but typically when we run into that situation, it is mostly a matter of throwing out things you have already put money into more than anything else. There is not a whole lot the faculty can get involved in.

Chairperson Moore recognized the Chair of the Admissions Advisory Committee, William Cohen.

Professor Cohen made the following remarks:

The Admissions Advisory Committee deals specifically with freshman admissions at the University. It consists of three appointed faculty members, Director of Admissions Pat Herring, Registrar Don Witt, Phil Kraemer is ex officio, Ray Cox, the Chair of the Admissions and Academic Standards Committee. We concentrate more on freshman admissions and are ruled by Senate Rule IV. We deal with, according to Rule IV, an admissions management system that we are suppose to advise on, advise on requirements and deadlines for admissions. In addition, there is a related committee, the Exceptions Committee, which deals with those students who do not fall under automatic criteria. We already have a meeting planned. Each year, we deal with selective admission criteria and deadlines. There is an ongoing study by Pat Herring and his staff with regard to those criteria. The major things I think that we will deal with this year are the general cleaning up of Senate Rule IV, dealing with rules pertaining to admission to the University. I was told there were a number of proposed changes in spring 1997 that were never fully incorporated into Rule IV. I think that in the spring we will actually come to the Senate with a proposal. In the offing there is the possibility of recruiting additional international undergraduate students at the freshman level who will not come as transfer students the way we have with some of our programs in Asia. The fact that the TOEFL is now being administered in different ways than it used to be, we have to deal with that issue in regard to Senate Rule IV. The last one is not a major issue because it only impacts on some students in the state, apparently only three schools, the so called International Baccalaureate program, which is an alternate to AP credit that we need to establish some standards for in terms of admission. I think that it is more of a European style examination based program. We need to build into our rules how we are going to give those students credit in the same way we deal with the AP program.

The Chair recognized Phil Kraemer, chair of the University Studies Committee:

Professor Kraemer made the following remarks:

The University Studies Committee helps govern the University Studies Program, which is our general studies curriculum required of all undergraduates at the University of Kentucky. The Committee is responsible for reviewing proposals for the addition of courses. It is also charged with recommending deletions and is also responsible for making general recommendations about the program. The important message or piece of news, if it is news, is that last year the committee expended considerable energy working on what is one of our strategic plans or indicators and that is to simplify the University Studies Program. They have brought forth recommendations that are at the Senate Council and I believe for open discussion at the next Senate meeting in October. I think that we need to consider those proposals carefully. The committee did a very good job in working under what I would consider duress to achieve an objective that we may want to pause and think a bit about. I will embrace these new recommendations or proposals but probably for reasons that have nothing to do with the objective of simplifying the University Studies Program.

Professor Cohen asked about the President's Initiative on undergraduate education. Were any of those ideas forwarded into the recommendations that will to to the Senate?

Professor Kraemer said that most of the items of the Swift Report do not require Senate action or, if they do, we are not at a stage where they would see that. Any obviously that does will be brought before the Senate. That report, along with another task force report, The Math Science and Technology Task Force Report, is now being translated into action plans. I am helping Vice-Chancellor Shirley Raines organize the appropriate groups of individual faculty, students, staff, and other administrators to try to articulate some specific plans for each of the nineteen recommendations in the Swift Report. We will be handling some rapidly and others will take some time and some will actually take some money.

The Chair recognized the Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Minorities, Anna Allen.

Ms. Allen made the following remarks:

I appreciate the honor to be able to serve in this capacity as the new chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Minorities. I would like to think as we approach the 21st century we don't need it, but we do. Our charge is to assist in monitoring the University's progress for achieving the equity goals and recommendations of the report issued by the Committee and accepted by the University Senate in 1990; to continue to investigate the economic, social, and political status of minority employees and students at the University in order to identify problems and recommend new initiatives, goals, and programs as necessary and appropriate; and, of course, to provide you with an annual report. In light of what has transpired this year, I'm sure and I thank those of you who are faculty who encouraged or brought your students to the Convocation Program with Archbishop Desmond Tutu, we have spent a lot of our time this year working with the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of African Americans on campus, and we would like to continue that momentum that was started. We want to offer recommendations for an holistic approach to the minority community, including the faculty, staff, and students. We want to review the curriculum of inclusiveness; we will be looking at the recruitment, retention, and graduation rates of African Americans and other minorities. We will be looking at the recruitment and retention of African Americans and other minorities in terms of faculty. We will offer recommendations for the upcoming presidential search committee. We will review the mentoring and sponsorship of minority faculty. We will offer recommendations that as we begin the 21st century our campus will reflect the lessons that we have learned from exclusion in the 20th century. For purposes of information, minorities are considered to be Blacks or African Americans, Asians, Hispanics/Latinos, Native Americans, or Asian Americans.

Chairperson Moore recognized Esther Edwards, representing Ramona Rush for the Ad Hoc Committee on Women.

Esther Edwards made the following remarks:

I am here on the behalf of Dr. Ramona Rush, who was unable to be here. She regrets she has to be in Washington D.C. for a memorial tribute for Dr. Donna Allen who is the Director of the Women's Institute on Freedom of the Press. Dr. Allen was co-editor of two books with Dr. Rush.

The issues, directions, and goals for this year's committee on the Status of Women are still evolving. The issues most likely will include those suggested by an e-mail survey conducted on the Lexington Campus last May about issues of concern to women. They include women's presence on the UK campus; day care and maternity leave policies and identification of UK women's organizations and networks.

The Chair recognized Scott Kelley, Chair of the Retroactive Withdrawal Appeals Committee.

This committee, as I have mentioned before, has been extremely busy. It was created about two years ago and first put in place this past year. Formerly retroactive withdrawal appeals were considered by the Senate Council Chair who is the person who considers waiver of rules. I felt very strongly, and was one of the prime movers behind the creation of this committee, that should not be the case--that it should be done by a committee. Scott has graciously agreed to do this for a second year and did a tremendous job last year.

Professor Kelley made the following remarks:

Our committee is set up for students who find themselves in situations where they missed the midterm withdrawal guideline to get a "w" for some pretty specific reasons. We hear these appeals and the criteria we have been given are serious illness or injury, serious personal or family problems, serious financial difficulties,

or a permanent disability, which was verified after the semester in question. The other guidelines that our committee follows are an all or nothing guideline. That is, when a student made this appeal, generally speaking, they either drop all their classes for that semester or none of them. The working rule that we use as a committee is if for some reason the student can demonstrate that just this one class was impacted by the circumstances, then we grant a more limited version of the withdrawal as opposed to all or nothing. The other guideline that we have is these withdrawals can go back two calendar years. When our committee started last fall we had a one year rule and we as a committee felt that was a little bit restrictive and in April switched to two years, and I think that will work a little better. This semester we will hear withdrawals for as far back as fall 1997. The other thing that we did last year was to create a University-wide form that we hope is widely available by now. That also helps facilitate our process. It makes it easier that we have a more uniform set of information.

In the fall of semester we heard eleven appeals. Nine were granted and two were denied. In the spring semester we heard thirty-five appeals, of which twenty-four were granted and eleven were denied. So we had forty-six appeals for the whole year.

The student can appear before us if he or she desires. They are also entitled to some sort of representation if they would like that.

Chairperson Moore said that he wanted to remind the Chairs that they were required to submit an annual report to the Senate Council.

Professor Pomeroy (Medicine) asked Ms. Edwards if her committee was dealing with the other half of the University, the Medical Center.

Ms. Edwards said that the survey involved the Medical Center, and they had a very good response.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Don Witt
Secretary, University Senate

You are visitor Unable to open config file for reading since November 1, 1999

Return to [University Senate Page](#)
Return to [University Senate Minutes](#)
Return to [Registrar's Home Page](#)

This page was last updated on 1 November 1999.

If you have [questions or comments](#) about this web page, please use this [comment form](#)

URL: <http://www.uky.edu/USC/Minutes/sm092799.html>